

REMARKS

SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

The applicant held a telephone interview with the examiner and the examiner's supervisor (Steven S. Hong) on 08/07/2008 to discuss the finality of the current office action. In particular, the applicant asserted that the finality of the office action should be withdrawn and a new office action issued since the examiner has not yet considered all of the claim limitations. In response to this argument, the examiner's supervisor presented a new ground for rejection asserting that the limitation "setting input focus on the first window" did not explicitly mean that the copy speech command is received while input focus is on the first window. In other words, the limitation of "setting input focus on the first window" was not considered as limiting the claims. The applicant agreed to amend the claims to clarify this aspect and now respectfully requests the examiner consider all of the claim limitations in the next office action.

REJECTION UNDER 35 USC § 103

The examiner rejected claims 48 and 49 under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Balakrishnan in view of Ito. The applicant believes the above claim amendments overcome this rejection.

Claim 48 (as amended) recites that while input focus is on a first window, receiving a copy speech command, and in response to the copy speech command: setting input focus on a second window, and waiting for the user to select text from the second window. When the user selects the text from the second window, performing the following steps independent of user input:

- copy the selected text;
- switch focus back to the first window; and
- paste the selected text into the first window.

In contrast, Balakrishnan (in view of Ito) discloses the following:

- set input focus on a first window;
- copy text from the first window; and
- paste text into a second window.

The applicant respectfully requests the examiner address all of the limitations recited in the claims. Balakrishnan does not disclose all of the above claim limitations independent of whether the command is a copy command as disclosed in Ito. The examiner should identify where Balakrishnan discloses the above claim limitations, or withdraw the rejection.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the applicant respectfully requests the examiner to withdraw the finality of the current office action and issue a new office action addressing all of the claim limitations. If it is believed that a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of the present application, or clarify matters with regard to its allowance, the examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 08/14/2008

By: /Howard H. Sheerin/
Howard H. Sheerin
Reg. No. 37,938

Howard H. Sheerin
Attorney at Law
23233 N. Pima Rd., Suite 113, PMB 174
Scottsdale, AZ 85255
Phone: 303-765-1689